

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

21 January 2020

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Regaiolli, B. and Angelosante, C. and Marliani, G. and Accorsi, P.A. and Vaglio, S. and Spiezio, C. (2020) 'Gum-feeder as environmental enrichment for marmosets and tamarins.', *Zoo biology*, 39 (2). pp. 73-82.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/zoo.21531>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article: Regaiolli, B, Angelosante, C, Marliani, G, Accorsi, PA Vaglio, S Spiezio, C (2020). Gum-feeder as environmental enrichment for marmosets and tamarins. *Zoo Biology* 39(2): 73-82 which has been published in final form at <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/10.1002/zoo.21531>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.



Gum-feeder as environmental enrichment for zoo marmosets and tamarins

Journal:	<i>Zoo Biology</i>
Manuscript ID	ZOO-19-051.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Regaiolli, Barbara; Parco Natura Viva - Garda Zoological Park, Research Department Angelosante, C; Universita degli Studi di Bologna Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie, Veterinary Medical Sciences – DIMEVET University of Bologna Marliani, Giovanna; Universita degli Studi di Bologna Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie, Veterinary Medical Sciences – DIMEVET University of Bologna Accorsi, Pier; Universita degli Studi di Bologna Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie, Veterinary Medical Sciences – DIMEVET University of Bologna Vaglio, Stefano; University of Wolverhampton Faculty of Science and Engineering, Biology, Chemistry and Forensic Science; Durham University, Anthropology Spiezio, Caterina; Parco Natura Viva - Garda Zoological Park, Research Department;
Keywords:	zoo primate welfare, callitrichines, gum Arabic

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research highlights

- Wooden gum feeders can improve the welfare of zoo marmosets and tamarins by stimulating their natural species-specific behaviors and decreasing stress-related behavior ~~and helping them to cope with stressful contexts~~.
- Zoo callitrichines, managed by adequate enrichment programs, may show positive welfare.

For Peer Review

Regaiolli *et al.*

1

Title: Gum-feeder as environmental enrichment for zoo marmosets and tamarins

Short running title: Gum-feeder as enrichment for marmosets and tamarins

Authors: Regaiolli B.¹, Angelosante C.², Marliani G.², Accorsi P.A.², Vaglio S.^{1,3,4} & Spiezio C.¹

Institutional affiliations:

¹Research and Conservation Department, Parco Natura Viva - Garda Zoological Park, Loc. Figara 40, 37012 Bussolengo, Italy

²Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie - Università di Bologna - Via Tolara di Sopra 50, 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO), Italy

³Department of Biology, Chemistry and Forensic Science, University of Wolverhampton, Wulfruna Street, WV1 1LY Wolverhampton, UK

⁴Department of Anthropology & Behaviour, Ecology and Evolution Research (BEER) Centre, Durham University, South Road, DH1 3LE Durham, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr Stefano Vaglio

S.Vaglio@wlv.ac.uk

+44 (0) 1902 323328

Abstract

Tamarins and marmosets are small-bodied social callitrichines. Wild callitrichines feed on exudates, such as sap and gum; particularly, marmosets are mainly gummivores, while tamarins consume gums only occasionally and opportunistically. Zoo marmosets and tamarins are usually provided with gum Arabic as an alternative to the exudates normally found in the wild. The aim of this study was to evaluate the effects of a gum feeder on the behavior and well-being of four zoo-managed callitrichines. We studied four cotton-top tamarins (*Saguinus oedipus*), four red-handed tamarins (*Saguinus midas*), two pygmy marmosets (*Cebuella pygmaea*) and three Geoffroy's marmosets (*Callithrix geoffroyi*) housed at Parco Natura Viva (Italy). We conducted the study over two different periods, a baseline (control, without the gum feeder) and then a gum-feeder (when the gum feeder was provided) period. We used continuous focal animal sampling to collect behavioral data, including durations of social and individual behaviors. We collected 240 minutes of observations per period per study subject, with a total of 3,120 minutes for all the subjects in the same period and of 6,240 minutes in both periods. We analyzed data by using non-parametric statistical tests. First, we found that the gum feeder promoted species-specific behaviors, such as exploration, and diminished self-directed behaviors, suggesting an enriching effect on tamarin and marmoset behavior. Moreover, in red-handed tamarins, the provision of the gum feeder reduced the performance of self-directed and abnormal behavior, specifically coprophagy. These results confirm that gum-feeders are effective foraging enrichment tools for zoo marmosets and tamarins.

Keywords: zoo primate welfare, callitrichines, gum Arabic

1 Introduction

Tamarins and marmosets are small-bodied New World monkeys belonging to the subfamily of Callitrichinae (Groves, 2001). They live in geographical areas ranging from Costa Rica to South Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay, with the greatest variety of species found in the Amazonian region (Emmons, 1990; Buckner *et al.*, 2015). They are cooperative breeders and may form familial groups made up of a breeding pair, several siblings and other members helping with parental care of the offspring. The breeding pair is dominant over other group members (Emmons, 1990; Smuts *et al.*, 1986).

The diet of wild tamarins and marmosets is affected by seasonality and availability of food resources; they mainly feed on fruit, insects, small vertebrates, leaves and nectar (Rosenberger, 1992; Garber, 1993; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). In addition, their natural diet includes plant exudates, such as gum and sap, which are rich in carbohydrates and minerals (Bairrão Ruivo, 2010; Power, 2010). Many plant gum exudates consist of β -linked complex polysaccharides which often also contain glycoproteins and proteoglycans (Gashua *et al.*, 2015) from which energy, water and minerals, particularly calcium, can be obtained after fermentation. Callitrichines require a high intake of calcium from their diet, as these species generally give birth to twins and plenty of milk is required during the nursing process (Garber, 1993; Kelly, 1993; Heymann and Smith, 1999; Pack *et al.*, 1999; Passamani and Rylands, 2000; Taylor and Vinyard, 2004). The benefits of gum feeding have been widely investigated in the wild. Therefore, supplementing the diet of zoo non-human primate species with plant gum exudates, might improve the diet and general well-being of these primate species in captive environments (Garber, 1993; Kelly, 1993; Heymann and Smith, 1999; Pack *et al.*, 1999; Passamani and Rylands, 2000; Taylor and Vinyard, 2004).

Plant gum exudates are an essential component of the marmoset diet, whilst it is less important for other callitrichines (Power and Oftedal, 1996; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010; Power, 2010). For this reason, marmosets show behavioral, morphological and metabolic adaptations to gum feeding. In particular, their dental adaptations allow them to gouge trees and thereby stimulate gum exudate production as part of the plants' response to wounding (Vinyard *et al.*, 2003; Vinyard *et al.*, 2004; Eng *et al.*, 2009; Burrows & Nash, 2010); while modifications of the gastro-intestinal trait permit the digestion of gums and other plant exudates (Coimbra-Filha and Mittermeier 1977; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). Tamarins tend to

Regaiolli *et al.*

feed on gum and sap only opportunistically, when this food is available in trees wounded by other animals, with seasonal variation in terms of time investment for gum feeding (Garber, 1993; Power and Oftedal, 1996; Power, 2010).

Zoo tamarins and marmosets are generally provided with commercially available gum Arabic, as a replacement for the various plant gum exudates that they consume in the wild (Goodrum *et al.*, 2000). Furthermore, these plant gum exudates may be crucial biochemical digestive challenges for the normal functioning of their digestive tract (Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). Wild tamarins show more frequent gum feeding during the afternoon, as gum digestion is time consuming and would therefore be easier during the night sleeping (Kelly, 1993; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). On the contrary, gummivore marmosets are known to eat gum frequently throughout the daylight hours as their gastrointestinal system is well-adapted to gum digestion (Kelly, 1993; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). Tamarins and marmosets are usually attracted to novel objects, and vigilant and aware of what happens in their surrounding environment (Menzel & Menzel, 1979). Promoting natural gum feeding behavior with specific devices might be important to enhance the feeding strategy and husbandry of zoo-managed callitrichines in order to improve their physical and mental well-being.

Giving zoo animals the opportunity to perform their species-specific behaviors represents one of the primary goals of modern zoological gardens. In addition, ethological parameters have been proven to be a valuable tool in assessing zoo animal welfare (Hill & Broom, 2009; Fontani *et al.*, 2014). The occurrence of natural species-specific behaviors, such as exploratory behaviors, is considered an indicator of good welfare status and enriched environment (Mench, 1994; Mellor & Beausoleil, 2015), while abnormal behaviors, such as excessive inactivity, stereotypies and self-injurious behaviors, may indicate poor welfare or stressful scenarios (Renner *et al.*, 2000; Manteca *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, self-directed behaviors such as self-grooming and scratching, are usually benign activities that occur commonly in non-human primates (Maestripieri *et al.*, 1992). However, in certain situations such as social tension and conflicting or frustrating contexts, self-directed behaviors can be associated with uncertainty and anxiety and have been considered as displacement activities (Troisi & Schino, 1987; Troisi, 2002; Lutz, 2014; Spiezio *et al.*, 2017). Thus, a decrease in self-directed behaviors might be considered as a positive welfare indicator, although these activities are normally included and well-represented in the species-specific behavioral repertoire of primate

species (Spiezio *et al.*, 2017; Leeds & Lukas, 2018). Similarly, coprophagy occurs in both captive and wild non-human primates and may have an adaptive value in these species; however, in controlled environment this behavior has been related to factors such as nutritional deficiency and medical problems but also boredom and social stress (Krief *et al.*, 2004; Prates & Bicca-Marques 2005). Therefore, coprophagy has been classified as an abnormal behavior and has been identified as a possible indicator of poor well-being (*i.e.*, Prates & Bicca-Marques 2005; Lutz, 2018).

Environmental enrichment is a widespread practice among modern zoos and has been found to promote the performance of species-specific behavioral repertoire and to address as well as prevent abnormal behavior (Hosey *et al.*, 2013). Though some callitrichines may not require gum to reach their nutritional needs in zoo settings, gum feeding may represent a behavioral necessity and could improve the diversity of the behavioral repertoire as well as the welfare status of zoo marmosets and tamarins (Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). In the current study, zoo tamarins and marmosets were provided with wooden drilled logs as gum-feeders. Previous research investigating the effects of a similar gum-feeder on zoo marmosets and tamarins suggested that this environmental enrichment could promote species-specific behaviors, reduce abnormal behaviors, such as stereotypies and coprophagy, and decrease inactivity (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Taylor, 2002; Huber & Lewis, 2011). In particular, the provision of hanging feeder baskets and sticks smeared with Acacia gum promoted feeding and foraging while decreasing stereotypic behavior, specifically excessive coprophagy, in red-handed tamarins in zoo (Taylor, 2002). Similarly, common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*) in different social housing conditions have been found to benefit from foraging enrichments, specifically gum feeders, promoting natural behaviors and leading to a reduction in the time spent performing stereotypic behavior such as pacing (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Roberts *et al.*, 1999). In general, providing zoo callitrichines with gum arabic in feeders that require specific feeding abilities has been found to promote naturalistic behaviors and feeding strategies described in the wild. In particular, artificial gum feeders are cheap and easy to build and can be helpful in enhancing the physical and mental well-being of these species, which are well-disposed to work for gum, enhancing also the educative value of zoo exhibit (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Huber & Lewis, 2011).

The aims of this study were to:

- Assess the effects of the gum-feeder on the behavior of two tamarin species (*Saguinus oedipus* and *Saguinus midas*) and two marmoset species (*Callithrix geoffroyi* and *Cebuella pygmaea*) which were scarcely investigated in the past. On the basis of prior work by other authors revealing that gum feeding represents a behavioral need and a digestive challenge for the digestive system of marmosets and, to a lesser extent, tamarins (Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010; Hosey *et al.*, 2013; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Taylor, 2002), we predicted that the gum feeder would increase the performance of species-specific behaviors, such as explorative and feeding behaviors and reduce inactivity and abnormal behavior.
- Compare the duration of gum Arabic feeding between tamarins and marmosets, particularly the time spent feeding on gum between the morning and the afternoon within the two groups, to identify the optimal time for gum provision. Since gum digestion is time consuming and would therefore be easier during night sleeping, tamarins show gum feeding more during the afternoon (Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). Thus, we expect that marmosets would perform gum feeding more than tamarins and during day time, while tamarins would eat gum during afternoon hours rather than in the morning.

Materials and Methods

Study subjects and area

We studied eight tamarins, specifically four cotton-top tamarins and four red-handed tamarins; and five marmosets, three Geoffroy's marmosets and a pair of pygmy marmosets. The study subjects belonged to two different age-groups: juveniles, including individuals aged less than two years (approximate age of sexual maturity, Tardif 1984; Ziegler *et al.* 1987; Abbott *et al.*, 2003; Tardif *et al.*, 2011) and adults, including individuals aged more than two years (Abbott *et al.*, 2003; Tardiff *et al.*, 2008; Tardif *et al.*, 2011) (Table 1).

All groups were housed at Parco Natura Viva-Garda Zoological Park (Bussolengo, Italy) in separated enclosures in the Tropical Green House. Although enclosures were not adjacent to each other, Geoffroy's marmosets, cotton-top tamarins and red-handed tamarins were in acoustic contact. Their enclosures were made of an outdoor and an indoor area and each area was approximately 30 m² and

contained trees, branches and logs, ropes, wooden boxes, sheds and shelves; the indoor areas were heated and provided with UV lamps. The pygmy marmoset enclosure was an 18 m² aviary.

During the study, the gum feeders were placed in the outdoor area of the enclosures. Tamarins and marmosets were fed twice a day with fruits, multi-cereal pap, mealworms, gum Arabic, and occasionally meat and eggs. Fresh water was available *ad libitum*. Manipulative, sensory or food-related devices were provided daily as environmental enrichment. The study, which did not involve any invasive or stressful techniques, was conducted in accordance with the EU Directive 2010/63/EU and the Italian legislative decree 26/2014 for Animal Research.

Procedure and data collection

The study was made of two different periods, the baseline and the gum-feeder period. During the baseline, gum Arabic was provided in bowls at the time of the afternoon meal following the daily routine husbandry. In the gum-feeder period, gum Arabic was provided, using the new gum feeders, at the usual feeding times over the morning and the afternoon. The gum-feeder consisted of a wooden drilled disc, with 10 to 15 holes each, on both sides of the disc (**Figure 1**). The discs were hung with ropes on the enclosure trees and branches, approximately 1.5 meters above the ground. The daily amount of gum Arabic was put in the holes of the feeder. In particular, the amount of gum Arabic per subject was prepared using approximately 8 grams of powder and 5 grams of water. The entire study consisted of 6,240 minutes (104 hours) of observation divided in the baseline (52 hours) and in the gum-feeder period (52 hours) for all the subjects. Per period and per subject, a total of 240 minutes of behavioral observations were carried out and two sessions per day per monkey were run (one in the morning, one in the afternoon). The duration of the data collection sessions per monkey differed between species based on the sample size. In particular, per period, data on each cotton-top tamarin (N = 4) and on each red-handed tamarin (N = 4) were collected during eight 30-minute sessions. For the marmosets, per period and per monkey, data were collected during six 40-minute sessions for Geoffroy's marmosets (N = 3) and four 60-minute sessions for pygmy marmosets (N = 2) for an overall of 240 minutes of observation for each subject within each period. Monkeys were observed in a prescribed sequence following a specific design to avoid time-of-day bias in data collection. Feeding and enrichment times were the same over the study period, one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

A continuous focal animal sampling method (Altmann, 1974) was used to collect durations of normal and abnormal individual and social behaviors (**Table 2**). The time spent out-of-sight, here defined as “not observed”, was also recorded. The red-handed tamarins were the only subjects to perform abnormal behavior, specifically coprophagy, which was reported in three out of four monkeys, although for a very low percentage of the total observation time (ranging from 0.13% to 1.67%). In order to assess the effect of the feeder on the behavior of the red-handed tamarins, we created the category stress-related behaviors (SRB), including coprophagy and self-directed behaviors. Although these behaviors are found in wild animals and may be adaptive, they both have been related to stressful and conflict situations within controlled environments (Troisi & Schino, 1987; Troisi, 2002; Prates & Bicca-Marques 2005; Lutz, 2014; Spiezio *et al.*, 2017; Lutz, 2018). The gum-eating behavior was included in the category “feeding/foraging” as in the first period gum Arabic was provided in bowls with other food; however, in order to compare the time spent feeding on gum between marmosets and tamarins, the duration of gum feeding from the new feeder was also collected (**Table 2**).

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using non-parametric statistic tests and significance level was set at $p < 0.05$ (Siegel & Castellan, 1992). In particular, the Wilcoxon test was used to compare the behavior of the study subjects between the two periods (baseline *vs.* gum-feeder), whereas the Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the time spent feeding on gum between the study groups (marmosets *vs.* tamarins) in the gum-feeder period. StatView version 5.0 (SAS Institute Inc.) was used for all the statistical analyses on behavioral data. In addition, single-case analyses were used to test the effect of the gum-feeder on the behavior of each individual, comparing the performance of SRBs between different periods within each individual of red-handed tamarins (Fisch, 2001) performing stress-related behaviors, specifically abnormal behavior and self-directed behavior. For the single-case analyses, Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test (Marx *et al.*, 2016) was used. For all behavioral categories, medians and interquartile range (IQR) are reported in the manuscript and tables.

Results

Baseline vs. gum-feeder period

We investigated the effects of the gum-feeder on the behavior of the study subjects comparing the time spent in individual and social behaviors as well as “not observed” between the two periods (**Figure 2, Table 3**).

When considering each individual behavior, Wilcoxon tests revealed that feeding/foraging, maintenance and self-directed were performed significantly more during the baseline than during the gum-feeder period, whereas the opposite pattern was found for visual exploration. No other significant differences were found (see **Figure 2** and **Table 3** for median, IQR and statistical values). On the other hand, within social behaviors, interspecific behavior was performed more during the baseline than during the gum-feeder period, whereas no other differences were found (see **Table 3** for median, IQR and statistical values). Finally, Wilcoxon test revealed that “not observed” was performed significantly more during the baseline than during the gum-feeder period ($z = -2.481, p = 0.013$) (**Table 3**).

Effect of the gum-feeder on tamarins

After evaluating the effects of the gum-feeder on all subjects, we focused on tamarins and marmosets separately. Regarding tamarins, within individual behaviors, feeding/foraging and maintenance were performed significantly more during the baseline than during the gum-feeder period, whereas no significant differences were found in any other behavioral category (see **Table 3** for median, IQR and statistical values).

Effects of the gum-feeder on marmosets

Regarding marmosets, “not observed” was performed significantly more during baseline than during the gum-feeder period ($z = -2.023, p = 0.043$), while no other significant differences were found between the two periods (see **Table 3** for median, IQR and statistical values).

Effects of the gum-feeder on stress-related behavior in the red-handed tamarins

Three red-handed tamarins (CS, OB and Normann) showed the abnormal behavior ‘coprophagy’. In order to test whether the gum-feeder positively affected the behavior as a measure of welfare of these individuals, a single-case analysis was done to compare the performance of SRBs between different periods within each

individual. For CS, the median duration of SRB was 113.5 (50) seconds in the baseline and 74.5 (51.25) seconds in the gum-feeder period; for OB, the median duration of SRB was 90 (70.25) seconds in the baseline and 52 (72.75) seconds in the gum-feeder period; for Normann, the median duration of SRB was 101 (99.75) seconds in the baseline and 60 (70) seconds in the gum-feeder period. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests revealed that SRB were performed significantly more during the baseline than the gum-feeder period in CS ($p = 0.037$) but no significant differences were found for OB and Normann ($p > 0.05$).

Gum-feeding in marmosets and tamarins

Finally, we focused on the time spent feeding on gum Arabic- by the study subjects. The median time spent feeding on gum Arabic was 42.5 (90.8) seconds for tamarins and 235 (255.5) seconds for marmosets. Marmosets tended to spend more time eating gum Arabic than tamarins ($U = 7$, $p = 0.056$). When considering gum feeding during the day within each group, the median time spent feeding on gum Arabic by tamarins was 31.5 (91.8) seconds in the morning and 0 (20) seconds in the afternoon. In the case of marmosets, the median time spent feeding on gum Arabic was 116 (207) seconds in the morning and 114 (281) seconds in the afternoon. Wilcoxon tests revealed no significant differences between morning and afternoon in both tamarins ($Z = -1.572$, $p = 0.116$) and marmosets ($Z = -0.365$, $p = 0.715$) (**Figure 3**).

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the effects of a gum-feeder, a wooden disc drilled with holes, on the behavior of zoo tamarins and marmosets, to assess their welfare. Moreover, the study aimed to compare the time spent feeding on gum Arabic between these species. First, each species interacted with the gum-feeders performing a new behavior to obtain gum Arabic, confirming the enriching role on the animal daily routine and feeding strategies of this device (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Huber & Lewis, 2011). All the study monkeys interacted with the gum-feeder and showed the behavior of eating Arabic gum from the holes. In particular, marmosets and tamarins had to cling on to the wooden disc holding with one or both hands and then retrieve gum directly with the mouth or grasping it with one hand. When retrieving the gum, marmosets gouged and scraped the disc moving the head and mouth similarly as in the tree-gouging behavior reported in the wild: indeed, the jaws were widely open around the gum in the hole, the upper jaw anchored on the

wooden disc whereas the lower jaws indented the area around the hole, favoring both gouging and scraping movements (Rylands, 1984; Vinyard *et al.*, 2003; Vinyard *et al.*, 2004; Burrows & Nash, 2010; Thompson *et al.*, 2014). This movement was less pronounced in tamarins as they simply retrieved the superficial gum coming out the holes and consumed it.

First, we found that subjects were out-of-sight (“not observed”) more during the baseline than during the gum-feeder period. This result seems to suggest that the gum-feeder could enhance the welfare of the study subjects, engaging them in the performance of species-specific behaviors and increasing the time they were visible to the public. This finding is consistent with previous research on gum-feeder provision in marmosets, reporting an increased animal visibility (Kelly, 1993).

Regarding individual behaviors, when data on tamarins and marmosets were pooled together, we found that feeding/foraging behaviors as well as maintenance behaviors were performed significantly less during the gum-feeder period than during the baseline. Within each group (tamarins and marmosets), we found the same patterns and significant differences for these categories in tamarins, whilst they did not differ significantly in marmosets. Gum Arabic is a high-energy food source, rich in carbohydrates and minerals, requiring longer time to be digested than other food items (Kelly, 1993; Power, 2010; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). It is possible that the provision of this food item in the new gum-feeder elicited tamarin and marmoset interest, inducing them to eat gum Arabic before the rest of the food. Given the nutritional properties of the gum (Power & Oftedal, 1996; Power, 2010), we speculate that a small amount of this food could be sufficient for these small primates, leading to the reduction in the overall time spent feeding and foraging in the second period. Also, it is possible that the interest toward the gum feeder as a novel device might supply the callitrichines with the need of looking for food elsewhere in the enclosure (*e.g.* bowls, usual feeding points). In other words, the study monkeys may have spent less time feeding and foraging in the second period because they consumed gum Arabic first, and the same could extend to the decrease in maintenance behavior during the second period. However, the presence of the gum feeder increased visual exploration, which was performed significantly more during the gum-feeder period than during the baseline. This behavior is particularly relevant in callitrichines as they are curious, attracted to novel objects and aware of their surroundings (Menzel & Menzel, 1979). Such features of these small-bodied primates have been related to improved vigilance and anti-predator behaviors (Caine, 1984). Therefore, the gum-feeder seemed to

encourage the performance of species-specific behaviors that are particularly important for the survival of the species in the wild (Caine, 1984).

The presence of the gum-feeder also led to a significant decrease in self-directed behaviors, which have been described as potential behavioral indicators of stress and anxiety in non-human primates, at least in some situations (Maestripieri *et al.*, 1992; Leeds & Lukas, 2018). As our results underlined a decrease in the performance of these behaviors, the presence of the gum-feeder seems to positively impact the behavior of the study monkeys (Spiezio *et al.*, 2017; Leeds & Lukas, 2018). However, the study monkeys spent a relatively low amount of time performing self-directed behaviors in both the baseline and the gum-feeder periods (4% and 3% of the total observation time respectively) suggesting that this statistically significant change may not necessarily be biologically important.

Regarding social behaviors, during the second period, a significant decrease of interspecific behaviors, including interacting with or directing attention to humans was also reported. As visitors may be distressing for the study subjects, this finding seems to highlight that the gum feeder might help tamarins and marmosets to better cope with humans, promoting the performance of species-specific social behaviors and discouraging possibly deleterious human-animal interactions. Together with the decrease in the time spent out-of-sight in presence of the feeder, this result highlights a possible positive effect of gum-feeding devices on callithricines' well-being in zoo environments.

Except for the decrease in feeding/foraging and maintenance behavior reported in the gum-feeder period, no significant differences between periods were found in tamarins. The decrease in feeding/foraging behaviors within tamarins seems consistent with the same result obtained when data from both species were pooled together. Indeed, tamarins do not have as many adaptations for gum feeding and digestion as marmosets (Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010; Hosey *et al.*, 2013; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Taylor, 2002); therefore, consuming the gum before other food items due to the new presentation modality might have reduced the tamarin appetite and the performance of other food-related behavior, but had no effect on gummivore marmosets. However, the lack of significant differences in marmosets might be due to the small sample size and thus further research is needed to better investigate this aspect.

On the other hand, marmosets were out-of-sight ("not observed") significantly more during the baseline than the gum-feeder period, suggesting that for these species the presence of the drilled wooden

discs might help to increase the visibility of these species to zoo visitors. Inactive behaviors, such as sleeping, were rather uncommon in the study subjects, as tamarins and marmosets tend to be very active during the day. However, the study subjects had rest in the wooden nest boxes in the highest part of the enclosure where the observer was not able to see them. Therefore, the behavioral category “not observed” also included resting, which was otherwise not recorded in the study periods. For this reason, it is possible, by decreasing the time spent out-of-sight, the presence of the gum-feeder also reduced inactive behavior of the study subjects, especially within marmosets. This is consistent with findings by other authors on common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*) (Roberts *et al.*, 1999).

When analyzing the behavior of each study subject during the two periods, we found that in three red-handed tamarins, the gum-feeder had a positive effect as reduced SRBs, such as self-directed behaviors and coprophagy. In addition, red-handed tamarins performed auto-coprophagy, which has been previously related to physical or psychological stress in non-human primates (Anderson *et al.*, 1991; Krief *et al.*, 2004; Prates & Bicca-Marques, 2005). One of the main effects of the gum-feeder was the reduction of SRBs, including coprophagy. This was reported in other studies on gum-feeders in the red-handed tamarin, suggesting that gum-related enrichment might be particularly relevant to prevent coprophagy in this species (Taylor, 2002), and on laboratory common marmosets, where similar gum-feeding devices decreased stereotypies (Roberts *et al.*, 1999).

Based on data collected during the second period, this study aimed at verifying the presence of differences in gum-feeding between tamarins and marmosets and investigate whether the time spent feeding on gum Arabic differed between morning and afternoon within each group. First, although no statistically significant difference was found, marmosets tended to feed on gum more than tamarins. This finding agrees with previous work on these species, as gummivore marmosets spend a large amount of time feeding on gum, based on the importance of this food in their diet, whereas tamarins rely more on fruit and invertebrates and cannot easily obtain and digest plant exudate (Kelly, 1993; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). However, it could not be excluded that the greater interaction of the marmosets with the feeder was due to species differences in approaching the new enrichment devices, as previously suggested (Renner *et al.*, 2000).

Similarly, no differences in time spent feeding on gum Arabic were found between mornings and afternoons, neither within marmosets nor within tamarins. In the wild, marmosets feed on exudates frequently throughout the daylight hours, as their gastrointestinal system is well-adapted to gum digestion (Kelly, 1993; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). Therefore, the gum-feeding behavior of the study Geoffroy's and pygmy marmosets resembles that reported in the wild, as the study subjects ate gum Arabic to the same extent in both the morning and the afternoon. In the case of tamarins, these species are known to eat exudates mainly during the afternoon, so that they can digest this food item overnight (Kelly, 1993; Heymann & Smith, 1999; Bairrão Ruivo, 2010). However, we collected data on the time spent eating gum but not the amount of gum that was eaten. Again, providing gum in the new gum feeders might have incentivized the consumption of this food item regardless of the time of the day.

Our findings seem to highlight positive effects of the gum-feeder on the behavior of zoo callitrichines, as previously reported in the species considered in the current study as well as in other species of marmosets and tamarins (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Taylor, 2002; Huber & Lewis, 2011). However, the small sample size and the relatively small amount of data collected in our study hamper the ability to draw firm conclusions and future research is needed to investigate more deeply the gum-feeding behavior of zoo callitrichines, focusing on larger samples and longer periods of time.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our findings suggest that providing zoo tamarins and marmosets with gum Arabic in a naturalistic and innovative way, such as using a wooden gum feeder, might enhance the welfare of these species by:

- 1) promoting the performance of species-specific behaviors, such as visual exploration and decreasing self-directed behaviors, that can in some cases indicate a stressful situation of the animal;
- 2) improving the visibility to zoo visitors by decreasing the time spent out-of-sight and in interspecific interactions;
- 3) reducing the performance of abnormal behaviors, as reported in the study of red-handed tamarins;
- 4) increasing the consumption of this crucial food item, at least in the first stages of the introduction of the feeder.

Our results add to previous literature on gum-feeding devices in tamarins and marmosets, highlighting that the wooden gum feeders can improve the welfare of these species in controlled environments by stimulating natural behaviors and promoting naturalistic feeding strategies (McGrew *et al.*, 1986; Roberts *et al.*, 1999; Taylor, 2002; Huber & Lewis, 2011).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Cesare Avesani Zaborra and Camillo Sandri for allowing this study to take place at Parco Natura Viva and for supporting this project; Carolina Sammarini and Daniela Galiotta, New-World primate zookeepers, as well as Giuseppe Federico La Cauza and William Magnone, zoo veterinarians, for their help during the study period; and Tim Baldwin for his invaluable suggestions on gum Arabic. Finally, we thank two anonymous reviewers that helped us improve the manuscript with their constructive comments.

References

Abbott DH, Barnett DK, Colman RJ, Yamamoto ME, Schultz-Darken NJ. Aspects of common marmoset basic biology and life history important for biomedical research. *Comp Med.* 2003; 53:339–350.

Altman J. 1974. Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour* 49: 227-267.

Anderson, J. R., C. Combette, and J. J. Roeder. 1991. Integration of a tame adult female capuchin monkey (*Cebus apella*) into a captive group. *Prim. Rep* 31:87–94.

Bairrão Ruivo E. 2010. *EAZA Husbandry Guidelines for Callitrichidae, 2nd edition*. Beauval Zoo.

Buckner JC, Lynch Alfaro J, Rylands AB, Alfaro ME. 2015. Biogeography of the marmosets and tamarins (*Callitrichidae*). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 82: 413– 425.

Burrows AM, Nash LT. 2010. *The Evolution of Exudativory in Primates. Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects*. Springer, NY.

Caine, N.G. (1984) Visual scanning by tamarins: a description of the behavior and tests of two derived hypotheses. *Folia Primatol.* 43, 59–67

Coimbra-Filha AF, Mittermeier RA. 1977. Tree-gouging, exudate-eating, and the short-tusked condition in *Callithrix* and *Cebuella*. In: Kleiman DC, editor. *The biology and conservation of the Callitrichidae*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, p 105-115.

Emmons LH. 1990. *Neotropical Rainforest Mammals: a Field Guide*. Chicago (US) and London (UK): The University of Chicago Press.

- Eng CM, Ward SR, Vinyard CJ, Taylor AJ. 2009. The morphology of the masticatory apparatus facilitates muscle force production at wide jaw gapes in tree-gouging common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 212(24): 4040-55.
- Fisch GS. 2001. Evaluating data from behavior analysis: Visual inspection or statistical models. *Behavioural Processes*. 54: 137-154.
- Fontani S., Vaglio S., Beghelli V., Mattioli M., Bacci S. & Accorsi PA. 2014 Fecal concentrations of cortisol, testosterone, and progesterone in cotton-top tamarins housed in different zoological parks: relationships among physiological data, environmental conditions and behavioral patterns. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 17: 228-252.
- Garber PA. 1993. Feeding ecology and behavior of the genus *Saguinus*. In: Rylands AB, editor. *Marmosets and Tamarins: Systematic, Behavior, and Ecology*. Oxford (England): Oxford University Press.
- Gashua IB, Williams PA, Yadav MP, Baldwin TC (2015) Characterisation and molecular association of Nigerian and Sudanese *Acacia* gum exudates. *Food Hydrocolloids* 51: 405-413.
- Goodrum LJ, Patel A, Leykam JF, Kieliszewski MJ (2000) Gum arabic glycoprotein contains glycomodules of both extensin and arabinogalactan-glycoproteins. *Phytochemistry* 54:99–106.
- Groves C. 2001. *Primate taxonomy*. Washington DC (US): Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Heymann EW, Smith AC. 1999. When to feed on gums: temporal patterns of gummivory in wild tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus fuscicollis* (*Callitrichinae*). *Zoo Biology* 18: 459-471.
- Hill, SP, Broom DM. 2009. Measuring zoo animal welfare: theory and practice. *Zoo Biology* 28:531–544.

Regaiolli *et al.*

Hosey G, Melfi V, Pankhurst S. 2013. *Zoo animals behavior, management and welfare*. Oxford (England): Oxford University Press.

Huber, H. F. & Lewis, K. P. 2011. An assessment of gum-based environmental enrichment for captive gummivorous primates. *Zoo Biology* 30: 71-78.

Kelly K. 1993. Environmental enrichment for captive wildlife through the simulation of gum feeding. *Animal Welfare Information Center Newsletter* 4: 1-2, 5-10.

Krief, S., Jamart, A. and Hladik, C. M. 2004. On the possible adaptive value of coprophagy in free-ranging chimpanzees. *Primates* 45: 141–145.

Leeds, A. & Lukas, K.E. (2018). Experimentally evaluating the function of self-directed behaviour in two adult mandrills (*Mandrillus sphinx*). *Animal Welfare* 27(1): 81-86.

Lutz CK. 2014. Stereotypic behavior in non-human primates as a model for the human condition. *ILAR Journal* 55: 284–296.

Lutz CK. 2018. A cross-species comparison of abnormal behavior in three species of singly-housed old world monkeys. *Applied Animal Behavior Science* 199:52-58.

Maestripieri D, Schino G, Aureli F, Troisi A. 1992. A modest proposal: displacement activities as an indicator of emotions in primates. *Animal Behaviour*, 44(5): 967-979.

Manteca X., Amat M., Salas M., Temple D. 2016. Animal-based indicators to assess welfare in zoo animals. *CAB Reviews*, 11:1–10.

- Marx, A.; Backes, C.; Meese, E.; Lenhof, H. P.; and Keller, A. (2016). EDISON-WMW: Exact Dynamic Programming Solution of the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Test. *Genomics Proteomics Bioinformatics*, 14(1): 55-61.
- McGraw WC, Brennan JA, Russell C. 1986. An artificial gum tree for captive marmosets. *Zoo Biology* 5: 45-50.
- Mellor, D. & Beausoleil, N. (2015) Extending the 'Five Domains' model for animal welfare assessment to incorporate positive welfare states. *Animal Welfare* 24: 241-253.
- Mench, J.A. (1994). Environmental enrichment and exploration. *Laboratory Animal*, 38-41.
- Menzel, E. W., and Menzel, C. R. (1979). Cognitive, developmental and social aspects of responsiveness to novel objects in a family group of marmosets (*Saguinus fuscicollis*). *Behaviour* 70: 251–279.
- Pack KS, Henry O, Sabatier D. 1999. The insectivorous-frugivorous diet of the golden-handed tamarin (*Saguinus midas midas*) in French Guiana. *Folia Primatologica* 70: 1-7.
- Passamani M, Rylands AB, 2000. Feeding behavior of Geoffroy's marmosets (*Callithrix geoffroyi*) in Atlantic forest fragment of south-eastern Brazil. *Primates* 41: 27-38.
- Power ML. 1996. The Other Side of Callitrichine Gummivory. In: Norconk MA. Rosenberger AL, Garber PA, editors. *Adaptive Radiations of Neotropical Primates*. Boston, MA, Springer,
- Power ML (2010) Nutritional and digestive challenges to being a gum feeding Primates. In: Burrows A, Nash L, editors. *The evolution of exudativory in Primates*. New York: Springer. 25–44.

Regaiolli *et al.*

- Power ML, Oftedal OT (1996) Differences among captive callitrichids in the digestive responses to dietary gum. *Am. J. Primatol* 40: 131–144.
- Prates, HM, Bicca-Marques JC, 2005. Coprophagy in Captive Brown Capuchin Monkeys (*Cebus apella*), *Neotropical Primates*, 13: 18-21.
- Renner MJ, Feiner AJ, Orr MG, Delaney BA. Environmental enrichment for new world primates: introducing food-irrelevant objects and direct and secondary effects. *J Appl Anim Welfare Sci* 2000;3(1):23 – 32.
- Roberts RL, Roytburd LA, Newman JD. 1999. Puzzle feeders and gum-feeders as environmental enrichment for common marmosets. *Contemporary Topics in Laboratories Animal Science*, 38(5): 27-31.
- Rosenberger AL. 1992. Evolution of feeding niches in New World Monkeys. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 88: 525–562.
- Rylands AB (1984) Exudate-eating and tree-gouging by marmosets (Callitrichidae, Primates). In: Chavdwick AC, Sutton SL editors. *Tropical Rain Forest: The Leeds Symposium Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*. 155–158.
- Siegel S, Castellan N.J. 1992. *Statistica non parametrica*. Milano (IT). McGraw-Hill.
- Smuts BB, Cheney DL, Seyfarth RM, Wrangham RW. 1986. *Primate Societies*. Chicago (US) and London (UK): University of Chicago Press.
- Spiezio C, Vaglio S, Scala C, Regaiolli B. 2017. Does positive reinforcement training affect the behaviour and welfare of zoo animals? The case of the ring-tailed lemur (*Lemur catta*). *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 196: 91-99.

- 1
2
3
4 483
5
6 484 Tardif SD. 1984. Social influences on sexual maturation of female *Saguinus oedipus oedipus*. *Am J Primatol*
7
8 485 6(3): 199-209.
9
10 486
11
12 487 Tardif SD, Araujo A, Arruda MF, French JA, Sousa MBC, Yamamoto ME. 2008. Reproduction and aging in
13
14 marmosets and tamarins. In: Atsalis S, Margulis SW, Hof PR, editors. *Primate Reproductive Aging*.
15 488
16 Interdisciplinary Topics in Gerontology. vol 36. Basel: Karger;. pp. 29–48.
17 489
18
19 490
20
21 491 Tardif SD, Mansfield KG, Ratnam R, Ross CN, Ziegler TE. The marmoset as a model of aging and age-
22
23 492 related diseases. *ILAR J*. 2011;52: 54–65.
24
25 493
26
27 494 Taylor, T.D. 2002. Feeding Enrichment for Red-Handed Tamarins. *The Shape of Enrichment: A. Quarterly*
28
29 495 *Source of Ideas for Enrichment* 11(2): 1-3.
30
31 496
32
33 497 Taylor AB, Vinyard C. 2004. Comparative analysis of masseter fiber architecture in tree-gouging (*Callithrix*
34
35 *jacchus*) and non-gouging (*Saguinus oedipus*) callitrichids. *Journal of Morphology* 261: 276-284.
36 498
37
38 499
39
40 500 Thompson, C.L., M.M. Valença-Montenegro, L. César de Oliveira Melo, Y.B. Maranhão Valle, M.A.
41
42 501 Borstelmann de Oliveira, P.W. Lucas, and C.J. Vinyard (2014). Accessing Foods Can Exert Multiple
43
44 502 Distinct, and Potentially Competing, Selective Pressures on Feeding in Common Marmoset Monkeys.
45
46 503 *Journal of Zoology*, 294: 1-9.
47
48 504
49
50 505 Troisi A. 2002. Displacement activities as a behavioral measure of stress in non-human primates and human
51
52 506 subjects. *Stress* 5: 47-54.
53
54
55 507
56
57 508 Troisi A, Schino G. 1987. Environmental and social influences on autogrooming behaviour in a captive
58
59 509 group of Java monkeys. *Behaviour* 100: 292-302.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Vinyard CJ, Lucas PW, Valença-Montenegro MM, Melo LCO, Valle YM, Monteiro da Cruz MAO. 2004. Where the wild things are: Linking lab and field work in studying tree gouging in common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 38: 200–201.

Vinyard CJ, Wall CE, Williams SH, Hylander, WL. 2003. Comparative functional analysis of skull morphology in tree-gouging primates. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 120:153–170.

Ziegler TE, Savage A, Scheffler G, Snowdon CT. 1987. The endocrinology of puberty and reproductive functioning in female cotton-top tamarins (*Saguinus oedipus*) under varying social conditions. *Biol Reprod* 37(3): 618-27.



188x176mm (150 x 150 DPI)



Figure 1: The gum-feeder provided to marmosets and tamarins. In the gum-feeder period, tamarins and marmosets were provided with wooden drilled discs, hanged in the outdoor enclosure and filled with Arabic gum. The picture shows one of the study Geoffroy's marmoset interacting with the feeder.

188x176mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 2: Behaviors of the study marmosets and tamarins. The bars report the % total duration in seconds of individual and social behaviors as well as “not observed” in the baseline and in the gum-feeder. Asterisks indicate categories that differed significantly between periods (Wilcoxon test: $p < 0.05$).

336x146mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Species	Name	Sex	Age
Cotton-top tamarin <i>(Saguinus oedipus)</i> <i>N = 4</i>	Mum	F	Adult
	Franca	F	Juv
	Rubik	F	Juv
	Dad	M	Adult
Midas tamarin <i>(S. midas)</i> <i>N = 4</i>	CS	F	Adult
	OB	F	Adult
	Norman	M	Adult
	CC	M	Adult
Geoffroy's marmoset <i>(Callithrix geoffroyi)</i> <i>N = 3</i>	Mum	F	Adult
	Dad	M	Adult
	Sbiru	M	Juv
Pygmy marmoset <i>(Cebuella pigmea)</i> <i>N = 2</i>	Peace	F	Adult
	Love	M	Adult

Table 1: Tamarins and marmosets involved in the study. For each species the table reports the subject name, sex (F = female; M = male) and age class (Adult: > 2 years of age; Juv: < 2 years of age).

Individual behaviours

Abnormal behaviour	Coprophagy.
Alert	Being watchful.
Exploration/Play	Exploring the environment, hunting, manipulating enrichment devices, leaves, twigs and other objects found in the enclosure by sniffing, biting, chewing, gouging, handling, pouncing on, grappling with.
Feeding/Foraging	Eating food found in the enclosure, either in bowls or foraging on trees, ground and other substrates.
Gum-feeder*	Eating gum from the gum-feeders (second period) .
Locomotion	Moving around in the enclosure, walking, running or jumping along trees or walls of the enclosure
Maintenance	Peeing, defecating, drinking.
Scent-marking	Marking branches, shelves, ropes and other substrates with ano-genital, supra-pubic or sternal glands.
Self-grooming directed b.	Cleaning or licking the own hair or other parts of the body, scratching with the hands or with the legs.
Visual exploration	Looking around quietly.

Social behaviour ~~behavior~~

Affiliative b.	Allo-grooming (using the hands and/or mouth to clean the partner fur or other parts of the body), being in contact with conspecifics, nuzzling (rubbing or pushing gently with the nose and mouth), anogenital inspection (orienting the face against or toward anogenital region of partner or use hands or mouth to investigate anogenital region of partner), stealing food/objects from the hands or from the mouth.
Agonistic b.	Fighting (biting, clawing, and wrestling), attacking (lunging at or pouncing on partner aggressively), cuffing, chasing, threatening (staring with lower eyebrows, furl brow, tongue flicking), mounting between same-sex individuals.
Interspecific b.	Interacting with or directing attention toward individuals of different species, such as humans (visitors, zoo-keepers <u>zookeepers</u>) or Azara agoutis (only in the Geoffroy's marmoset enclosure).

Not visible

Not observed	The individual is not visible to the observer or it is not possible to identify the behaviour <u>behavior</u> being performed.
--------------	---

*This behavioural category was recorded only in the second period, when ~~Arabic~~ gum arabic was put in the gum feeder and it was possible to detect clearly that the subjects were feeding on that food item.

Table 2: Study ethogram. Individual and social behaviours collected in the study periods.

	All			Tamarins			Marmosets		
<i>Individual behavior</i>	Baseline	GF	<i>Z</i> and <i>p</i> -value	Baseline	GF	<i>Z</i> and <i>p</i> -value	Baseline	GF	<i>Z</i> and <i>p</i> -value
Abnormal	0 (0)	0 (9)	#	0 (60.8)	0 (79.5)	#	0 (0)	0 (0)	#
Alert	7 (17.5)	0 (4.5)	$z = -1.868$, $p = 0.062$	8 (15.8)	4 (9.5)	$z = -1.016$, $p = 0.310$	5 (18.5)	0 (0)	$z = -1.826$, $p = 0.068$
Expl/play	869 (1307.5)	663 (612)	$z = -1.922$, $p = 0.055$	974.5 (1569.5)	857.5 (1308.5)	$z = -1.400$, $p = 0.161$	321 (1509)	494 (723.5)	$z = -1.214$, $p = 0.225$
Feeding/Foraging	1219 (590.5)	826 (665.5)	$z = -2.481$, $p = 0.031^*$	1312.5 (635.3)	1233.5 (864.5)	$z = -2.100$, $p = 0.036^*$	1081 (653.5)	763 (485.5)	$z = -1.483$, $p = 0.138$
Locomotion	2920 (980.5)	2859 (1572.5)	$z = -0.384$, $p = 0.701$	2958.5 (890.3)	3340.5 (1155.8)	$z = -2.260$, $p = 0.208$	2920 (1199.5)	1622 (1432)	$z = -1.483$, $p = 0.138$
Maintenance	57 (70)	10 (32)	$z = -3.111$, $p = 0.002^*$	83 (42.8)	13 (30.5)	$z = -2.521$, $p = 0.012^*$	19 (11.5)	0 (22.5)	$z = -1.761$, $p = 0.078$
Scent-marking	38 (36.5)	22 (28.5)	$z = -1.049$, $p = 0.294$	27.5 (36)	28 (32.8)	$z = -0.491$, $p = 0.624$	49 (55.5)	19 (37)	$z = -0.944$, $p = 0.345$
Self-groomingdirected	420 (240.5)	392 (337)	$z = -2.201$, $p = 0.028^*$	464 (257.3)	437.5 (183.3)	$z = -1.260$, $p = 0.208$	384 (250.5)	208 (354)	$z = -1.753$, $p = 0.080$
Visual expl	6891 (2946.5)	8097 (1760)	$z = -2.201$, $p = 0.028^*$	6578 (3024.8)	7860.5 (2860.3)	$z = -1.680$, $p = 0.093$	7080 (2402.5)	8119 (2034)	$z = -1.483$, $p = 0.138$
<i>Social behavior</i>									
Affiliative	764 (632.5)	1331 (1180.5)	$z = -1.712$, $p = 0.087$	704.5 (753.5)	776.5 (798.8)	$z = -0.560$, $p = 0.575$	1110 (964)	1797 (1269.5)	$z = -1.753$, $p = 0.080$
Agonistic	0 (34.5)	8 (28.5)	$z = -0.533$, $p = 0.594$	9.5 (43.3)	7 (20.8)	$z = -0.280$, $p = 0.779$	0 (21.5)	8 (54.5)	$z = -1.604$, $p = 0.110$
Interspecific	0 (69)	0 (0)	$z = -2.023$, $p = 0.043^*$	0 (59.3)	0 (0)	$z = -1.342$, $p = 0.180$	38 (94)	0 (0)	$z = -1.604$, $p = 0.110$
<u>Not observed</u>	<u>956 (881.5)</u>	<u>207 (553.5)</u>	<u>$z = -2.481$</u> , <u>$p = 0.013^*$</u>	<u>724.5 (846.5)</u>	<u>172 (633)</u>	<u>$z = -1.540$</u> , <u>$p = 0.124$</u>	<u>1117 (740)</u>	<u>303 (615)</u>	<u>$z = -2.023$</u> , <u>$p = 0.043^*$</u>

*Significant difference between the two periods ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3: Individual behaviors, and social behaviors and “not observed” in the baseline and in the gum-feeder period. For each behavioral category, the table reports the median (interquartile range) duration in seconds calculated in the baseline and in the gum-feeder period (GF), as well as the z and p values of the Wilcoxon test performed to compare the two periods. All: data collected on different species pulled together; Tamarins: analysis performed within the tamarin group ($N = 8$) (*Saguinus oedipus*, *Saguinus midas*); Marmosets: analysis performed within the marmoset group ($N = 5$) (*Callithrix geoffroyi*, *Cebuella ~~pigmea~~pygmaea*).